

**Remarks/Arguments:**

In light of this Amendment, claims 1-59 and 61-69 are pending, as this Amendment cancels claim 60. The Office action dated October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2005 allows claims 1-42 and 44-52, rejects claims 56, 60-61, and 66-67 as depending from a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable, rejects claim 43 as anticipated by newly cited art to Bachl (US Pat. 6,860,621), and rejects claims 53-55, 57-59, 62-65 and 68-69 as obvious over Holman in view of Bachl. As the referenced Office Action is final and prosecution on the merits is closed, the Applicant's lack of substantive comment as to the Examiner's asserted breadth for the term "micro-optical structures" is not to be considered acquiescence to or disagreement with that assertion.

Claim 43 is amended to recite a "diffractive micro-optical surface pattern" in place of "micro-optical structures" which the Office Action characterized as "extremely broad". Allowed claims 16 and 33 also recite a reflective surface having a diffractive surface pattern (specifically, "at least one of a diffractive and a refractive surface pattern"), and no reference is cited as including or seen to include a reflective surface having a diffractive surface pattern, so amended claim 43 is seen to be in condition for allowance. Claims 62-65 depend from claim 43 and are also seen to be in condition for allowance.

Formerly dependent but allowable claim 56 is rewritten in independent form and is seen to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 53 is amended with the element of allowable claim 60. Claim 60 is canceled, and dependency of claim 61 is amended in light of that cancellation. Claim 61 is further amended for clarity. Claims 53-55, 57-59 and 61 are now seen to be in condition for allowance.


Formerly dependent but allowable claim 66 is rewritten in independent form and is now seen to be in condition for allowance. Dependency of claim 68 is changed to depend from claim 66. Claims 66-69 are now seen to be in condition for allowance.

In view of the amendments made herein and the previous determination as to allowed and allowable subject matter, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner pass each of

Appl. No. 10/622,296  
Amdt. Dated November 17, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2005

claims 1-59 and 61-69 to issue. The undersigned representative welcomes the opportunity to resolve any matters that may remain, formal or otherwise, via teleconference at the Examiner's discretion.

Respectfully submitted:

  
Gerald J. Stanton  
Reg. No.: 46,008


November 17, 2005  
Date

Customer No.: 29683  
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
Phone: (203) 925-9400  
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245  
Email: gstanton@hspatent.com

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

November 17, 2005  
Date

  
Name of Person Making Deposit